

Applicati n No. 09/970458
Page 2

Letter Response

Although Euteneuer does disclose that a balloon may be used to expand the stent, the sleeves 14 and 16 still need to be retracted prior to expanding the stent with the balloon. With a self-expanding stent, mere retraction of sleeves 14 and 16 will allow the stent to self-expand. However, with a balloon expandable stent, sleeves 14 and 16 must be retracted prior to balloon expansion.

Therefore, Euteneuer does not disclose a device with "a stent retaining sleeve being constructed and arranged to retract toward the attached first end when the stent is expanded". (Emphasis added).

By the time the stent is expanded by the balloon, the stent retaining sleeves of '646 have already been retracted, and their retraction is not caused by the stent expansion.

Based on the preceding, applicant respectfully requests that the §102(b) rejection to claims 1 and 7-10 based on Euteneuer be withdrawn.

§102(b) Based On Dusbabek US 5968069

Reference numeral 108 of Figures 15 and 16 in this reference is not to a stent retaining sleeve which is disposed about a portion of the stent, but instead is a mounting body located inside the balloon that the stent is mounted to and to which the balloon and stent is crimped.

It is clear from the specification that "disposed about a portion of the stent" means that the sleeve extends over a portion of the stent (see page 4, line 24). Therefore, mounting body 108, which is located inside the balloon and underneath the stent, which is arranged around the balloon, cannot be construed to be a stent retaining sleeve disposed about at least a portion of the stent.

Based on the preceding, applicant respectfully requests that the §102(b) rejection

Applicati n No. 09/970458
Page 3

Letter Response

to claims 1-3 based on Dusbabek be withdrawn.

§103 Rejection

The §103 rejection fails to meet claims 1 and 4-6 because it is based in part on Euteneuer, discussed above. As applicant has explained above, Euteneuer does not disclose a device with "a stent retaining sleeve being constructed and arranged to retract toward the attached first end **when** the stent is expanded". (Emphasis added). Therefore, the combination of Leiker in view of Euteneuer also fails to meet claims 1 and 4-6.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the allowance of claims 1-10.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: June 27, 2003

By: _____

Richard A. Arrett
Registration No.: 33153

6109 Blue Circle Drive, Suite 2000
Minnetonka, MN 55343-9185
Telephone: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001

f:\wpwork\raa\10087us_and_20030427.doc